



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,751	11/17/2003	Jason G. Lang	117P1846US01	3348

7590 03/04/2005

IPLM Group, P.A.  
Post Office Box 18455  
Minneapolis, MN 55418

EXAMINER

ROWAN, KURT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3643

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/714,751

Applicant(s)

LANG ET AL.

Examiner

Kurt Rowan

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 49-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Newly submitted claims 49-51 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the method of trapping can be performed by another and materially different apparatus than recited in the article claims.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 49-51 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 7, 12, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Celestine for substantially the same reasons stated in the first Office Action.

3. The patent to Celestine shows a rodent trap having a wall portion 15, a floor portion 16, a front portion 12, a top portion 11, and sides configured to define a cavity below door 30 and bottom wall 16 in extension 17 as shown in Fig. 1-3. The cavity is

Art Unit: 3643

between the wall portion and the front portion. Celestine shows a trap assembly 30 providing access to the cavity. Celestine shows a removable insert receptacle 40 arranged to be housed within the cavity and proximate to the trap assembly. Celestine shows the removable insert receptacle is configured and arranged to contain a rodent within the cavity. The area of Celestine is also a cavity 15 surrounded by walls 12, 13, 14 above the floor 16 and roof 11. Celestine inherently makes the removable insert receptacle from a non-destructive material to thereby prevent the escape of the rodent.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celestine for substantially the same reasons stated in the first Office Action.

The patent to Celestine shows a rodent trap as discussed above. In reference to claims 2, 22, Celestine does not disclose that the removable insert receptacle is made from metal, but it would have been obvious to make it from metal. See *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416 which states that the selection of a known material is based on its suitability for the intended use. In reference to claims 4, 16, 29, 37, Celestine shows a climbing assist member 18, but it would have been obvious to employ more than one for

Art Unit: 3643

multiplied effect. See *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378. Celestine does not show the climbing assist member being positioned between the wall portion and the front portion and between the floor portion and the top portion and between the sides and being enclosed there between. However, Celestine does show a climbing assist member as a friction surface 18 on ramp 14. At any rate it would have been obvious to employ a climbing assist member or members anywhere in the interior of the trap where it is deemed desirable. See *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70 which states that the rearrangement of the location of parts is obvious. Applicant should recite the structure of the climbing assist members and the trap in more detail. In reference to claims 5, 11, Celestine does not disclose a maintenance card within the cavity, but it would have been obvious to employ one to determine when the trap was last serviced. In reference to claims 6, 9, Celestine does not disclose that the front portion of the trap looks like a vent, but it would have been obvious to disguise the trap as is well known in the art for the purpose of keeping people away from it.

6. Claims 3, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Celestine as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Denny et al.

Art Unit: 3643

The patents to Celestine and Denny show rodent traps. Celestine has been discussed above and does not disclose a glue board. The patent to Denny shows a trap 20 having a glue board 86,88. In reference to claim 3, it would have been obvious to provide Celestine with a glue board as shown by Denny to retain the rodents in the removable insert receptacle.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Celestine, in reference to claims 1, 12, 18, 29, 43, does not show that the cavity can contain a rodent because the rodent could escape from the cavity through the swinging front wall. However, the claim states that the cavity is configured and arranged to contain a rodent, which does not preclude the rodent from leaving. The claim just requires that the cavity can hold a rodent. At any rate, the cavity of Celestine since it is a trap also not only contains the rodent but also precludes the rodent from exiting. Celestine shows a trap assembly that provides access to the cavity by the rodent and prevents the rodent from exiting the cavity. In reference to claims 12, 18, Celestine shows the interior 15 exposed by the swinging front wall 14 and the insertion opening do not allow for the rodent to be contained therein. However, the rodent is contained in box 40 which is contained in the interior 15. The door 30 provides access to the cavity and acts as part of a trap assembly. Also, the trap assembly of Celestine helps to prevent contaminants from entering the cavity through the elevated trap assembly due to the infrared sensor and the ramp 14.

Art Unit: 3643

The elevated trap assembly of Celestine also provides the only entrance into the cavity. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to modify the reference into having the appearance of a vent as recited in claims 6, 9, 23, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the knowledge is generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art by merely attaching the back wall 13 to the side wall of a building and changing the appearance of the trap to resemble a vent. See *In re Dailey et. al.*, 149 USPQ 47. This would not render the trap unsatisfactory for its intended purpose or even change the principle of operation of the trap. This would permit the rodent box to be removed from the trap from the insertion opening. Hence, making Celestine resemble a vent is possible without completely redesigning the trap and would involve only routine skill in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3643

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is 703 308-2321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703 308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Application/Control Number: 10/714,751

Art Unit: 3643

Page 8

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kurt Rowan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kurt" and last name "Rowan" clearly distinguishable.

Kurt Rowan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3643

KR